

Approved

**Terminal Facilities and EIR Referral Issues Study Committee
Airport Advisory Commission**

Minutes for Meeting #11

July 15, 2004

MEMBERS

PRESENT

Ron Salk
Alan Fox
Bruce Alton
Bernhard Clever
Douglas Haubert
Bob Luskin
Carol Soccio
Deborah Veady
Don Temple

MEMBERS

ABSENT

STAFF

PRESENT

Chris Kunze
Dottie Jones
Lonnie Mitchell
Jeri Werner
Malcolm Oscarson
Rachel Korkos
Greg Sorensen
Sharon Diggs-Jackson
Ken Ashmore
Sileneka Smith
Steve O'Keefe
Christine Edwards

OTHERS

PRESENT

See Attached sign-in
(Available on request)

Call to Order

Chair Ron Salk called the Study Committee to order at 5:25 p.m., at the Long Beach Energy Department.

Roll Call

Chris Kunze called roll and certified that a quorum was present.

Minutes

The minutes of June 17, 2004 were approved.

Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as submitted.

Chairman Salk Opening Statement

Chairman Salk thanked the public for attending. Chairman Salk stated that based on the input that the Commission has received over the past few meetings, he asked the Airport staff to take the three recommendations that were made initially and to amplify the points that he felt needed to be fully addressed. He stated that the recommendations were revised and asked Mr. Chris Kunze to read those recommendations.

Mr. Kunze stated that at the last meeting, staff provided the Commission with the staff recommendations for the scope of the terminal improvements, including parking facilities., which was based on HNTB's analysis and input, and also input from the Commission and the public. He distributed the presentation stating that at the end of the presentation there were three recommendations:

- 1) to authorize the Chair to transmit the project scope as presented by staff, along with the EIR scope to the City Council,

- 2) that the Commission recommends that a phase-in plan for the commuter airline related capacity be developed by the Airport Advisory Commission, in order to give staff a protocol as to when the additional capacity would be added,
- 3) the Commission believes that the actual design of the terminal improvements is critical to ensuring that facilities are in keeping with the Airport's unique history and architecture.

Mr. Kunze stated that staff's recommendation to the Commission is that the Commission work with the Cultural Heritage Commission to review the actual design in terms of historical/architectural conformance. He stated that based on additional issues brought up by the Commission and the public, staff has now drafted an expanded list of recommendations. The recommended action is to authorize the Chair to transmit the following terminal facilities project scope recommendations to the City Council, along with the EIR scope and other study recommendations which will be forthcoming. A breakdown is as follows:

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Authorize the Chair to transmit the following Terminal Facilities Project scope recommendations to the City Council, along with EIR scope and other study recommendations, which will be forthcoming:

1. Scope of the Terminal Improvements project should be that which is attached hereto, "Recommended Proposed Passenger Terminal Improvements". It is understood by the Airport Advisory Commission that this scope is only for purposes of conducting environmental impact analysis.
2. The Airport Advisory Commission requests the opportunity to re-evaluate its project scope recommendations in the light of the completed environmental impact report, and provide any recommended modifications to the project scope, as appropriate.
3. The Airport Advisory Commission recommends that a phase-in plan for commuter airline-related facilities be developed, and that the Airport Advisory Commission be tasked to generate a recommended protocol for aligning commuter slot allocation with availability of related facility capacity.
4. The Airport Advisory Commission believes that actual design of terminal improvements is critical to ensuring facilities that are in keeping with the Airport's unique history and architecture, and as such, recommends that the Airport Advisory Commission and Cultural Heritage Commission jointly establish a design review and input process which allows for timely progress while at the same time results in a product of which the Long Beach community can be proud.
5. The Airport Advisory Commission is supportive of the staff-recommended guiding principles, and recommends that staff and the City Attorney's Office identify options available to ensure that the project, as ultimately identified, is utilized as intended and only to reasonably accommodate the activity generated by 41 airline and 25 commuter daily flights.

In furtherance of this stipulation, it is recommended that the final design of the departure

lounge component be governed by the minimum space required by building/fire code. It is also recommended that the holdroom circulation area be designed to comfortably permit flow through by deplaning passengers along with post-screening departing passengers, and that the circulation area and concession area be physically separated from the departure lounge. Finally, the concession area should be designed to provide patrons with a wide array of food/beverage/gift choices, and the Airport Enterprise Fund with a significant revenue source, but it should not be designed to provide additional departure lounge-style waiting area above and beyond that provided within the departure lounges.

6. Regarding the airline and TSA office components of the terminal improvements, it is recommended that no construction of these components be commenced without some form of funding commitment from these end users.

Chairman Salk stated that the meeting's purpose is for the Commissioners to take the expanded recommendations under consideration, and to debate them. He stated that the process must be done in an open forum, leading to a vote. Chairman Salk made a motion that the recommended actions for the Airport Advisory Commission, previously read by Chris Kunze, be adopted. Commissioner Luskin seconded the motion.

Commissioner Luskin questioned the graphic handed out at the last meeting depicting the phases of possible terminal improvement area, and asked about Phase 2, commuter aircraft parking. He was concerned about the location to MillionAir North and whether there would be a displacement of general aviation aircraft. He stated that if that were to happen, he would want another location designated to accommodate the airplanes that will be displaced. He stated that before Phase 2 commuter aircraft parking is implemented, that Parcel O be developed to create general aviation parking.

Mr. Kunze stated that the intention of the Airport Advisory Commission's recommendation to the City Council is that they ask the Commission for a phasing protocol that would include those types of issues. He stated that Parcel A-1, the MillionAir facility, is zoned for terminal support uses according to the 1979 Land Use Plan adopted by the City Council. He stated that Parcel O was intended to be available for displaced aircraft.

Vice-Chair Fox asked about the recommended actions and particularly item #1, which referenced an attachment. Mr. Kunze stated that the referenced document is the powerpoint presentation that broke down the facility recommendations by functional area, security, office, concessions, holdroom and parking, given to the Commission at the June meeting. Vice-Chair Fox also asked about #2, "the Airport Advisory Commission requests the opportunity to reevaluate its project scope recommendations, in the light of the completed Environmental Report", and if that were to mean that it would give the Commission flexibility in terms of coming back after the EIR has been issued. Mr. Kunze stated that that is correct, and that the whole purpose of defining the scope is to get moving with the EIR. He stated that the EIR cannot be completed without a project scope. He stated that before the City Council would act to approve construction, they would have to consider the EIR.

Commissioner Haubert stated that Mr. Kunze referred to the powerpoint presentation; however, the document that was motioned and seconded is referring to recommended Long Beach Airport terminal improvements, which he believes is a different document. Mr. Kunze stated that the document referenced as the attachment is the powerpoint presentation and that the facility recommendations are the same in both documents. Commissioner Haubert stated to be clear, the document that they are discussing is entitled "Recommended Long Beach Airport Terminal Improvements, June 17, 2004. Mr. Kunze stated that that document may be used in that the recommended scope of the project is the same. Commissioner Haubert stated that the presentation distributed is different from the one received at last month's meeting. He noted on page 3, the first bullet notes the south holdroom, and in the other presentation, the first bullet relates to upgrades from 1985 to 2001. Mr. Kunze stated that the square footage of each of the recommended facilities is the exact same in both documents, which is what the recommendation references.

Commissioner Alton asked what the Commission is attempting to move on at this meeting. He stated that looking at the first paragraph of the recommendation, it indicates that the Commission is authorizing the Chair to transmit the terminal facilities project scope recommendations to the City Council, along with the EIR scope and other study recommendations, which will be forthcoming. He asked if all three of the elements will be grouped together and dealt with on a holistic manner, prior to anything being sent to City Council. Chairman Salk stated that that is the approach. Commissioner Alton stated that he is in agreement with that approach. Mr. Kunze stated that it is up the Commission as to what they want to recommend, however, staff will recommend at the next Commission meeting that the Commission consider the issue of what should be in the EIR, and what other studies that staff would recommend. He stated that at that time, the Commission can say that no terminal improvements should be made until all studies, including the EIR study and any other study, even if those studies take 10 years to do are completed. Chairman Salk stated that they are currently taking up the sizing issue, followed by the EIR, to be taken up at the next meeting, and that they would not transmit one matter without the other. Commissioner Alton stated that he would have difficulty making precise recommendations on square footage and allocations of uses, unless it were bound with the understanding of the scope of the EIR and other significant community impact interests with respect to the terminal improvements. He stated that without looking at all of those factors in a holistic manner, he is not prepared to make a decision on whether it is a good plan in terms of square footage allocation. He stated that the most significant risk is in the area of financing, and referenced the City Council authorizing moving forward on \$15 million of commercial paper to deal with a number of airport improvements not connected with the terminal improvement activity. He stated that the parking garage concept study was approximately \$32 million, for a total cost of \$47 million, and that he believes that the total cost of improvements is something that the Airport Enterprise Fund would be responsible for.

Mr. Kunze stated that he and staff are in agreement, and that the guiding principles that staff recommend that the Commission recommend to the City Council states that improvements will only be constructed after a financial plan that provides for full amortization of investments, with no General Fund impact, has been identified.

Commissioner Alton stated that when the \$15 million commercial paper proposal went to the City Council, there was a statement that there would be no General Fund exposure, as it would be paid by Passenger Facility Charges. He stated that that may be true given that passengers are arriving to provide those charges. He stated that if the passenger facility charge does not cover those costs, what would the Airport Enterprise Fund use to pay of the commercial paper. Mr. Kunze stated that the \$15 million commercial paper that Commissioner Alton is speaking about has nothing to do with the terminal improvements, but relates to funding that has already been approved by FAA grant money and passenger facility charges. He stated that if the number of flights were cut in half, there are two options: move from \$3 to \$4.50 PFC, and/or extend the PFC to more years, and use additional bridge financing.

Commissioner Clever stated that he has seen a number of airports, small, large and in-between. He stated that he believes that the improvements to the terminal facilities needs to be done. He stated that he has not been convinced, through all the months of testimony, that the improvements will bring more traffic. He stated that the City has affirmed that there is a cap on 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights and that he believes that the improvements are just to serve the present clientele. He stated that he has spoken to many residents who have said the Airport should be improved, and that is his belief.

Commissioner Haubert asked about the financing and read the statement from the document entitled Recommended Long Beach Airport Terminal Improvements, June 17, 2004, page 5, as follows: "improvements will only be constructed given a financial plan providing for full amortization of investment with no General Fund impact". He stated that there are two ways which that could be read, 1) that the Airport could commit \$60 million, the City acquires funding, they amortize the amount of the cost over the time the terminal is expected to last, and fix rents on users of the terminal, or 2) If the City were to engage in a leaseback construction project, the same way the temporary terminals were done, where a tenant would offer that the City does not have to secure \$60 million of funding, that they would front \$60 million of funding, stay for 10 years, and take rent credits. He stated that that would shift the risk from the City. He stated that it provides that the airline will commit to at least 10 years. He stated that the two concepts are polar opposites and could be construed reading the same sentence.

Chairman Salk asked Commissioner Haubert that if the financing issue was addressed, would he be for improvements at the Airport. Commissioner Haubert stated that he is absolutely for looking at all the improvements, but believes that there are a lot of moving parts, and it is not a simple question or answer.

Commissioner Haubert asked for clarification of bullet #2 that states "the Airport Advisory Commission requests the opportunity to reevaluate its project scope recommendations", and when would that reevaluation take place.

Mr. Mike Mais, Assistant City Attorney, stated that the task of the Commission now and at next month's meeting, where the Commission will consider the scope of the EIR, as directed by City Council, is to give a recommendation to them as to what the Commission believes the scope of the project should be. He stated that what action the Commission takes at this meeting is not a final recommendation to the City Council at this point. He stated that the

Commission is only charged with making a recommendation regarding what should the project look like when it is evaluated by the EIR, and once that is defined, the drafters of the EIR will take that project scope, put it into the EIR, and evaluate that project scope. Within that EIR, there will be four or five separate alternatives also analyzed. He stated that once the EIR is in draft form, it will circulate for 60 days, during that time the Commission could comment on the EIR and the contents. He stated that what would likely happen is that the once the EIR has been completely circulated, and before City Council votes to approve or not approve the project, he envisions that it would come back to the Commission for a recommendation to the City Council as to whether the project should be approved as proposed by staff, or recommend one of the alternatives, or something else.

Chairman Salk stated that by the wording of their motioned document, the Commission is recommending the sizing of the Airport. Mr. Mais stated that for the purposes of putting together the EIR, the Commission is recommending what the project will look like, and that it will come back to the Commission to make another recommendation when the EIR is all prepared.

Commissioner Soccio asked why the Commission has to look at one sizing. Mr. Mike Gatzke stated that he believes that the problem may be from the specific wording in recommended action #2. He stated that as a CEQA lawyer, he would not use the term "project scope" as used in the document, but would use a CEQA term of "proposed project", and "final project or adopted project", and that distinction is what is being spoken to here. He stated that in order for an EIR to be prepared, CEQA requires that the person preparing the EIR identify the proposed project.

Commissioner Haubert stated that as worded in #2, it is clear that it is worded improperly. He stated that he believes that the thought was that the document would be modified later on after the project scoping is completed, and then if the scope was changed, the DEIR would also have to be changed. Mr. Gatzke stated that that is not correct, and that if the word "scope" was removed in both places that it appears, it would make sense. Commissioner Haubert stated that with one exception, the Commission is being asked to make a recommendation on what the project should be built out to be, and that it will start as a scope of an EIR and then progress. Mr. Gatzke stated that the Commission is being asked to make its recommendations to the City Council as to what the proposed project should be. Commissioner Haubert stated that is not correct, that they are being asked to give a recommendation as to what the project should be, and to recommend on the scope of the EIR. Mr. Gatzke stated that he disagrees.

Mr. Kunze stated that in reading the document, both sentences should be read together, which states that it is for the purpose of conducting an Environmental Impact analysis, which is the purpose of defining the scope. He stated that the Notice of Preparation (NOP), which has already been distributed, had four alternatives, the recommended project, the no-project alternative, taking away the temporary facilities and returning to what was there before those temporary facilities, and an old design, before JetBlue, that increased the size of the existing holdroom. He stated that those alternatives would be visited in the EIR.

Commissioner Temple stated that it is clear that a proposed project scope is needed and that he believes his role is to discuss recommendations relative to of the terminal improvements. He stated that the subject of financing should be discussed at a later time. He stated that what should be decided at this meeting is the proposed project scope.

Commissioner Luskin stated that in talking about the proposed project scope, HNTB's research and presentation is an excellent starting point to make a recommendation. He stated that the Commission may see more in the EIR, and stated that he would like to see accommodation of 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights. He stated that regarding the health risk assessment that issue should be taken up with the City Council. He stated that HNTB's concept for the terminal improvements are excellent and that he is in favor to it. He made a motion that the Commission accept the terminal improvements given to the Commission and present them to the City Council. Chairman Salk stated that there is already a motion on the floor.

Commissioner Alton stated that an important consideration in discussing the financial issues, is that it is a multifaceted complex issue that he does not want to oversimplify. He stated that he is not in favor of moving forward, unless he understands the big picture.

Commissioner Luskin stated that he does not believe that the Commission is oversimplifying but that they need a starting point. He stated that there will be an EIR and that EIR will be discussed at length, and he stated that if they start now, the project will take a long time, and if the Commission goes along with what Commissioner Alton says, it could be ten years in doing the research and believes it looks like a stall tactic.

Commissioner Alton stated that for the last six months, many members of the audience on both sides of the issue have given important points to deliberate. He stated that it is critical that those points are deliberated and not pushed to the side.

Commissioner Temple asked about the timing for their recommendations, and asked if the City Council has asked the Commission to look at the financing of the project. Chairman Salk stated that they have not, and that they have been asked to recommend what modification should be made, if any, at the Airport.

Commissioner Alton stated that the Commission has been asked to do three things, one being a general statement that states " respond to requests by the public for other information such as Airport impact on real estate value, health hazard risk to the local environment, including impact from ports, freeway, and the Airport.

Chairman Salk stated that they are being asked to recommend a proposed project to the City Council, whether they agree with the Airport or disagree.

Commissioner Alton stated that he agrees there must be a starting point, and suggests that that starting point should be a plot plan and the number of square footage requirements for certain uses, but surrounded by and supported by the other named critical uses.

Commissioner Haubert stated that the financing issue was put as a guiding principle in a document entitled "Recommended Long Beach Airport Terminal Improvements", and also in

a document distributed by the Chair which says "no construction of these components be commenced without some sort of form of funding commitment from the end users." He stated that they are putting in their own guiding principles regarding how the project should be financed.

Commissioner Alton stated that he is more interested in content than timing. He stated that he wants to get the issue settled but with a broad understanding of all attributes associated with increasing the size of the Airport. He stated that he would want to visit the issue of the 41+25 flights and what impacts there might be should the Airport size be increased. He stated that there is an argument that no more than those flights will be generated out of the Terminal facilities, and he disagrees with that. He stated that the City Council or any other agency has not stated that the noise ordinance cannot be penetrated, that there is not that commitment behind that statement. Chairman Salk asked Mr. Gatzke about the limits of the EIR and of the 41+25 flights, and if the scope of the EIR would have to take into account a potential for increased flights. Mr. Gatzke stated that CEQA does not require that type of EIR scope. He re-stated that they must first define what the proposed project is, and then decide what the scope of the environmental studies to be

Commissioner Alton stated that he has concerns as to what they are being asked to do at this meeting, and at what point the decisions will be made and transmitted to the City Council in the form of their recommendations. He stated that he is open to establishing a fundamental base to work from in terms of project layout, and that base needs to be supplemented with a number of other relevant issues. Specifically, that they not only recommend a layout size and arrangement, but also recommend that issues associated with the scope of the EIR and other important community concerns be treated in a fashion that the Commission can have closure on. He stated that the holistic element of that is what should be transmitted to the City Council.

Chairman Salk stated that the purpose of this meeting is to get a consensus from Commissioners on the issue of whether the Airport is adequate to serve the needs, which needs to be answered in order to go on to the next stage.

Commissioner Luskin stated that the last statement on the recommended actions states, "some form of funding commitment from the end users". He stated that before there is a form of funding commitment, the Commission needs a basis to start from, a plan has been given to them by staff and by HNTB and that he believes that would be a start.

Commissioner Soccio asked if the Commission was going to deliberate each of the recommended items. Chairman Salk stated that the motion is the entire document. Commissioner Soccio stated that the document consists of six items. She stated that regarding the 41+25 flights, however, the ordinance is set up to fill a noise bucket, and if it is not full, that flights can be added. She stated that if there are more than 41 commercial flights, why would they not want to do a health risk assessment?

Mr. Kunze stated that HNTB presentation included a forecast of the most likely achievable scenario, and that they did not feel that there would be more than nine additional flights, and zero additional commuter flights. He stated that whether or not there is a health risk assessment or any other specific view of environmental impact is an issue that the Commission will be addressing at the next meeting. He stated that in the EIR, they will look

at not only the 41+25 forecast, 4.2 million annual passengers, but also examine 5 million passengers, which includes the additional nine potential flights.

Vice-Chair Fox stated that the Commission is considering the recommendations contained in the motion, based on what is contained in the document distributed on June 17th. He stated that if the Commission approves the recommended actions, that would include all the considerations including all of the guiding principles set forth in the longer document distributed on June 17th. Mr. Kunze agreed and stated that the guiding principles are part of the recommendations to City Council.

Vice-Chair Fox stated that it is his understanding that the Airport Advisory Commission would make a vote on the proposed scope of the terminal improvements and would address the EIR in the next meeting. He stated that he understands that the EIR could vary considerably, based on the scope, and of the proposed project, possibly not talking at this point about an EIR that the Commission would look in the very near future. Mr. Gatzke agreed and stated that the contents of the EIR will be driven by the definition of the proposed project, the scope of the terminal improvements. Vice-Chair Fox stated that the Commission does not have that proposed EIR at this point. Mr. Gatzke stated that the Commission cannot complete the analysis, because until they know what it is they are proposing to build, they can't answer the question. "what will the environmental impacts be on surrounding communities". He stated that what will come from the next meeting is a set of recommendations regarding the scope of the EIR.

Vice-chair stated that Mr. Gatzke is citing CEQA for definition, and stated that it is the opposite of what Commissioner Alton is stating regarding having the holistic approach of looking at everything at the same time. Mr. Gatzke stated that there is a set of recommendations regarding what the proposed project is, but there is also language that states that there should be recommendations regarding the scope of the EIR and other study recommendations such as financing, etc. He stated that he understands Commissioner Alton as saying that he wants to know whether or not the six recommendations will be transmitted to the City Council separate from the other recommendations, and understands that Commissioner Alton does not want that to happen.

Vice-Chair Fox asked if that was a realistic demand. Mr. Gatzke stated that it is, and that it may be the proper way to do it. However, the discussion regarding doing several studies over the course of a time period and bringing each one back to the Commission, and then decide on each study, is not reasonable. He stated that the recommendations of the Commission as to what the proposed project should be and what the scope of the environmental study ought to be, what additional studies ought to be prepared as part of the study process, packaging all of those recommendations into one package, and sending the whole package to the City Council is reasonable.

Mr. Kunze stated that staff would like to move ahead with the EIR based on the scope of a proposed project for EIR purposes and move ahead with any other studies that may or may not be apart of that EIR, and as those studies are done and the EIR is done, come back through the Commission on the way to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Chairman Salk stated that the recommendations of June 17th were set forth to describe what the Airport felt it needed in the way of facilities. He stated that the matter remains, what size

should the Airport be after hearing from all sources. He stated that that may be oversimplifying, but their must be a starting point and that the motion suggests that there are safeguards built in, and that the Commission has been meeting for eight months, and that there must be opinions as to whether the Airport is adequate to serve the needs, in balance with the concerns of the community. He stated that if the Commissioners believe that improvements are not needed, or if there are Commissioners that feel improvements are needed, that this is the time to state that position.

Chairman Salk stated that he believes improvements are needed to provide facilities just to meet current business.

Commissioner Veady stated that she believes that some improvements are needed. She stated that she is unsure about accepting the document in its entirety.

Vice-Chair Fox stated that a vote could be taken, and that he believes that all the Commissioners recognize a necessity for some improvements, and that the issue becomes the process.

Commissioner Alton stated that there is definite merit in many of the suggestions, and as long as that merit is thoroughly understood in terms of the risk that may be transmitted from that to the community, and that risk is well understood and mitigated, then he has no problem. He stated that what has not been addressed is the unintended consequences of doing the job wrong and stimulating a threat to the ordinance that has the consequence of more than 41+25.

Commissioner Haubert stated that he has heard people state and that he reviewed the minutes of earlier meetings and noted that Commissioner Luskin stated that he would like to see the City pursue a course that would be least likely to evoke a challenge to the noise ordinance, and would like to see the noise ordinance stay in place. He stated that he believes that everyone agrees with that premise. He stated that the question should be "how much can you expand the terminals without creating an enticement to someone to challenge the ordinance". Commissioner Haubert reviewed concerns about the noise ordinance brought to the Commission from presenters, and discussed the needs and wants of the terminal improvements. He stated that he does not believe that you can stop at the need and ignore the wants, because the wants can make Long Beach Airport better and more convenient. He stated that he wants to make the Airport more convenient. He stated that he is looking at it from the viewpoint that if they will improve the terminal for the convenience of the passengers, which are wants, that he would want that also. He stated that the need is to protect the noise ordinance and that need should be put ahead of the wants.

Chairman Salk stated that he listened to all of Commissioner Haubert's comments and that it seemed that he would have to vote against any improvements because of a potential danger in voting for those improvements. Commissioner Haubert disagreed with that statement, and said that the improvements are a want and not a need. He stated that it is not a necessity, that there are 41 flights coming and going now, and it works. He stated that he would like to see a graduated process, and asked if there were any other Commissioners that would like to see a graduated process, versus a large or no-build options. He stated that staff has recommended an overall proposal, and that he would like to see a scaled down version of that, and then a scaled down version of that, because the EIR should look at alternatives. He

stated that what is motioned on the floor is the large version and that he would like to take the time to develop smaller options.

Commissioner Temple stated that he is in agreement with Commissioner Haubert. He stated that in his opinion, he wants the Airport to be safe and secure. He stated that the difference between the wants and needs is dollars. He stated that his fear is that if they don't build it, someone will attack the ordinance, but that it could be looked at both ways. He stated that he would like to look at a scaled down version to vote on. He stated that he feels that improvements need to be made, but does not feel that a vote needs to be taken at this meeting. Chairman Salk asked Commissioner Temple if he would prefer not to vote on the recommended for action. Commissioner Temple stated that he would rather have two or three scenarios of size to vote on, rather than just one.

Commissioner Luskin stated that he believes they need a place to start and that the recommendation for action that is on the floor, may not ultimately be what they wind up with, however, a starting point is needed. He stated that HNTB gave a good presentation that they obviously know what is needed with 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights. He stated that if a vote were taken that he would vote in favor of the recommended action, because it moves the process to the EIR, where they would then have a chance to discuss, analyze, and make any necessary changes.

Commissioner Soccio stated that she has reviewed the materials received, and that from the HNTB figures and from staff recommendations, and asked if the pictured handout of the parking positions was to scale. Mr. Kunze stated that it is to rough scale, to give a sense of sizing. Commissioner Soccio asked if the ruled 1" to 50' pertained to all the buildings on the handout. Mr. Kunze stated that the handout was reduced to mass-produce the handouts, which altered the scale of the measurements. Commissioner Soccio asked if there was room for everything between Taxiway C and the buildings that exist now. Mr. Kunze confirmed that, and stated that one thing that drives the capacity is the overall size of the ramp. He stated that there is room for the proposed project including the 16 aircraft parking positions, using property to the north and one parking position to the south, and no more than that. The handout depicts a mixed use of aircraft, and one of the 12 parking positions is for a standby backup aircraft such as that currently used by JetBlue to minimize late departures caused by delayed arrival aircraft. Commissioner Soccio clarified that in talking about increasing the size of the terminal, it also takes into account adding six aircraft parking positions. Mr. Kunze agreed. Commissioner Soccio stated that she sees the need for restrooms, and concessions, and TSA baggage screening. She stated that she would like to see improvements made, not to the extent shown on the handout, that she would like to see the number of parking positions reduced from 16, as she understands that that number is what is most controlling the capacity. She stated that use of the commuter slots may not happen, and is unaware of anyone that has shown interest. She stated that from the standpoint of holdrooms, and baggage claim, that she believes there is a need for more circulation areas, and that she believes improvement is needed, but not as much as presented.

Commissioner Haubert made a substitute motion, to direct staff to come back at the next meeting with three different proposals, alternative A, what has already been prepared, known as Recommended Long Beach Airport Terminal Improvements, alternative B, encompass all the details but scaled down, and alternative C, scaled down further from alternative B. He

stated that the purpose of these alternatives is to look at the varying degrees and options of how the Terminal facilities could be improved.

Chairman Salk asked if it would be better for Commissioners to put forth the alternatives after what they have heard. He stated that the Airport has submitted its recommendations, and may not wish to give a scaled down proposal.

Commissioner Haubert asked Mr. Kunze to comment on whether or not scaled down versions could be submitted as alternatives. Mr. Kunze stated that it would be possible, and asked for 60 days. He stated that there is a technology to it and it would take time to process the request through the consultants. He stated that a helpful item would be to further define their expectations, such as if there is no problem with the size of security screening, TSA, concessions, etc. it would be helpful information so to focus on items of concern, versus blanket reductions. Commissioner Haubert stated that from his perspective, he would like a reduction in the concessions, the holdrooms, and possibly parking and aircraft parking.

Commissioner Alton stated that he would like to protect and enhance the security area, that it is extremely under-facilitated, and that the Airport security staff has a small work area and that he would like to protect that. He stated that he would like to get a sharper view of the needs of TSA. Chairman Salk stated that TSA gave Airport staff their recommendations. Commissioner Alton stated that they did give a number, but did not give any detail behind that number or give the Commission the opportunity to answer any questions, and that he does not have closure with the level of their input. He stated that a reduction in the number of aircraft parking spaces is needed and that the holdroom is where it needs to be, with growth in the concession, but not a quadrupling in size. He stated that he seconds the motion to have A, B, C, based on input given to the Airport staff.

Mr. Mark Christoffels stated that vehicle parking is unique. He stated that it is a revenue source. He stated that in looking at alternatives, the parking sizing has been consistent in bringing all the parking on-site. He stated that staff has a fear that if parking is not brought on –site, that the private sector will pick it up, which would result in the community having more outlying parking lots. He stated that vehicle parking is not a limiting element to the Airport, and stated that where there is not enough vehicle parking, the private sector will pick it up. He stated that staff wants to get clarification that that is the Commission's view as well, to try to maintain on-site all necessary parking. He stated that currently Airport parking is operating a leased lot from Boeing, and Boeing is moving forward with development, and the leased lot will go away, which would put parking in the neighborhoods or a private sector operator will pick it up.

Commissioner Soccio stated that she has no problem with the parking lot as presented by staff. She stated her understanding that it would encompass the car rental agencies, and that certain parts are designated for employees and business needs.

Commissioner Alton stated that he is in agreement with the principle of bringing parking on-site, however, where he deviates is in the area of the financing of it. He stated that the proposed \$32 million design may be the single most expensive item in the deliberations. He stated that because it is a revenue generator, the FAA cannot be used for support. He stated that just as the proposal that commuter slots will be phased in, the vehicle parking should be looked at in the same light, not to invest \$32 million and build it completely out,

because there could be an empty or partially empty structure for many years.

Commissioner Temple stated that he was involved in a process that built a 400-car garage, which was designed to allow for two additional stories, and the cost for adding the additional two stories was more than the initial building of the garage. He stated that a parking structure cannot be built in phases, because it is too expensive.

Chairman Salk called for a vote of the substitute motion. The vote was taken as follows:

- Commissioner Alton – Aye
- Commissioner Veady – Aye
- Chairman Salk – Aye
- Vice-Chair Fox – Nay
- Commissioner Soccio – Aye
- Commissioner Luskin – Nay
- Commissioner Temple – Aye
- Commissioner Haubert – Aye

Chairman Salk stated that the substitute motion passes with 6/Aye, 2/Nay.

Mr. Mike Kowal stated that he would have liked to have reviewed the recommendation to have staff bring back alternate sizing options, and asked for more openness from the Commissioners so that the public will know where each stands on the issues. Vice-Chair Fox stated that on the subject of talking/non-talking, that all the presentations given over the 6-7 months, have been to persuade. He stated that the conversations between the Commissioners similarly are intended to persuade, and at the end of the discussion a vote is taken, which is the important factor. Mr. Kowal stated that wherever the recommended actions came from, they did not come from the Commissioners. He stated that there are recommendations presented by HUSH2 regarding putting 10% of airport revenue aside fund future litigation, and that was not addressed. He stated that the whole issue is about money and revenue for the City, and to ask the question if the Airport is a good thing for Long Beach, and stated that he does not believe that it is, taking everything into consideration, including the health factor and property values.

Mr. Joe Sopo thanked the Commission for their openness, and stated that he believes that everyone agrees on the fact that they do not want the Noise Ordinance busted, that he does not want more than 41 flights.

Mr. Hans Lees asked if there were any other drawings of the proposed improvements, and that the handout that he had was very schematic. Mr. Kunze stated that in the report presented by HNTB, there is data that supports how the drawing is sized, and that the handout is the only good visual representation. Mr. Lees stated that the 41+25 flights and that the 25 commuter flights upset him and that he does not believe that they are mandated. Mr. Mike Mais stated that the 25 commuter slots have been part of the City's ordinance since 1995 when the case was settled with the approval of the court. He stated that it has all along been on the table, but has not been raised because since 1995 there has not been any interest by any of the carriers to doing commuter flights from Long Beach. Mr. Lees stated that it is not the fault of the community that the holdrooms are crowded, and asked why there should be an expanded concession area. He stated that the Airport is a municipal Airport and not in competition with larger Airports.

Mr. Kevin McAchren stated that he agrees with Commissioner Temple that an effort must be made to accommodate in a proper manner the passengers at the Airport, and to not do so would be an invitation to legal action. He stated that he is not supportive of a downsized alternative, however, a plan of 250,000 square feet should be reviewed. He stated that regarding the concession space, it is a great revenue source as is the vehicle parking proposal.

Mr. Jeff Huso stated that he hope Commissioner Haubert and Commissioner Alton will keep a watch on the proposed alternatives percentage sizing.

An unidentified speaker stated that he could not find meeting information on the website. He stated that a terminal designed for 15 flights can now hold 41, a 273% increase, and if the terminal is designed to hold 41 flights, at 273% that would be 112 flights. He stated that he is in favor of exploring three alternatives and finding a compromise that everyone can live with.

Mr. Alex Wilcox stated that he would like to respond to comments that 50% of the Long Beach Airport holdroom area was unoccupied and that Sacramento retail space was not occupied. He stated that JetBlue had done research and found that Sacramento, Terminal A, fiscal year 2003, had boarded 2.9 million customers, which is less that they are boarding currently at Long Beach., and had gross sales of over \$11 million on the concession side, and over \$3 million on the retail side. He stated that if asking the personnel that work there if their job is a need or a want, their answer would be obvious. He stated that the other need that they have is to pay for the improvements, and concessions will help them do that. He stated that JetBlue will meet the wants of the customers but that will not enable them to meet the needs of the project. He stated that there are only a few periods a day when the terminal is overflow, just as one's personal home is not always used each moment of the day. He stated that with respect to the sizing and how many flights that can be squeezed through, the guideline industry average is approximately 3 ½ to 4 turns per day per gate. He stated that theoretically they could run 100 flights a day out of the current facility per day with 10 parking spots, and maximize 160 flights a day from a 16-gate facility.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Dottie Jones, Airport Secretary, Long Beach Airport

Approved